

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
UNDER 37 CFR 1.8 (a)



I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being deposited with the United States
Postal Service as first class mail in an enve-
lope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231,
on May 20, 1991
GORDON W. HUESCHEN, Attorney

Alaine L. Killen
Dated 5-20-91

12-

GP125

RECEIVED

91 MAY 24 AM 11:37

GROUP 120

Merz 16/dlk

#7
JRP
5/28/91

* * * * *

Applicant : Joachim Bormann, et al.
Serial No. : 07/508,109
Filed : April 11, 1990
Title : ADAMANTANE-DERIVATIVES IN THE PREVENTION AND
TREATMENT OF CEREBRAL ISCHEMIA
Art Unit : 125
Examiner : T. Wilson

* * * * *

Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AND WITHDRAWAL OF FINALITY
OF THE FINAL REJECTION

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated March 29, 1991, a
Final Rejection, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of
the finality of this rejection on the foregoing grounds:

The first Action objected to the term "prevention of" in
Claim 10.

In Response, the term "prevention of" was deleted from Claim
10.

In a telephone conversation, the Examiner advised that
"treatment of" was now being reconsidered by his SPE and, in a
subsequent telephone conversation advised that "treatment of" in
Claim 10 was now considered to be incredible (an entirely new
position by the USPTO).

The undersigned attorney could not cancel Claim 10 at that
time and, indeed, the surprising reversal of the previously-
stated position of the USPTO constituted an entirely new ground


of rejection, never before placed in writing by the USPTO.

The Office Action dated March 29, 1991 was an improper Final Rejection since the ground of rejection of Claim 10 stated therein had never before been placed in writing in an Office Action and was only advised to the undersigned attorney over the phone as a change in the previous position of the USPTO.

The undersigned attorney requires more time to respond to the new ground of rejection set forth in the Office Action dated March 29, 1991 and accordingly respectfully requests that the finality of the said Office Action, which was not in accord with proper procedure, be withdrawn, thereby to enable the undersigned attorney a full six (6) month period to respond to the new ground of rejection, to the best of his ability to do so in view of the fact that the client is in Germany and that the preparation of a suitable rebuttal to the outstanding new ground of rejection will be time consuming in view of the distance which is involved as well as in view of the complexity of the new problem raised for the first time by the last Office Action (the Final Rejection).

Respectfully submitted,

G O R D O N W . H U E S C H E N



Attorney GWH/dlk

Dated: May 20, 1991
715 The "H" Building
310 East Michigan Ave.
Kalamazoo, MI 49007
616-382-0030

Enclosure: Return postal card receipt